

MORE FACTS,

OR A

REPLY

TO A

PAMPHLET

ENTITLED A

STATE OF FACTS, &c.

---

By JOHN HEYSHAM, M. D.

---

*CARLISLE:*

PRINTED BY J. MILLIKEN.

---

M, DCC, LXXXIII.



## R E P L Y, &amp;c.

*Quousque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra?*

CIC.

A FEW days ago \* a Pamphlet, containing no less than *six quarto pages*, with a large Appendix, entitled a State of Facts, or Observations on Dr. Heysham's Bills of Mortality in Carlisle, for the Year 1782, was published by Mr. Hodgson. As the evident intent and meaning of this elaborate publication was to reflect honour on that Gentleman's character, in order that it may have the desired effect, he thinks it necessary that the Public should be acquainted with the secret History of the State of Facts.

This work is not the hasty production of a moment, nor the labour of a single individual, but the united efforts, as I have been informed, of *three distinguished Personages*, who have toiled at it with unremitting and almost unparalleled assiduity for upwards of *nine weeks*†. These Personages are, first, Mr. John Hodgson late Surgeon to the Carlisle Dispensary, whose *modest and truly amiable character*, has been but too long unnoticed, and unknown, but who of late, however, by a fortunate coincidence of circumstances, appears to be a *grateful and generous friend*‡; a *scrupulous observer of truth*; a *conscientious christian*; and one whose *extensive experience*, and *great abilities as a Surgeon* must entitle him to the esteem, friendship, and patronage of the *virtuous and the wise*.

The second is supposed to be a *learned and ingenious Physician*||, who, it is said, with *great delicacy*, not above fifty years ago, translated a short treatise in Latin, on the subject

---

\* State of Facts was published on Sept. the 30th.

† Observations on the Bills of Mortality (to two notes in which, State of Facts was intended by the author as an answer) were published on the 23d of July.

‡ This very Mr. Hodgson has over and over declared, in the most positive manner to Mr. Mitchinson and several other Gentlemen, *that I saved his life*. The other parts of his character have already appeared from what he has written, or will appear from what I have to write.

|| In justice to this Gentleman's character it may not be improper to mention, that he is not one of those, who, from an affectation of reserve, conceal what they know, on the contrary he is eager in the pursuit of information, and as ready to communicate it for the benefit

subject of abortions, into the English language, for the perusal and entertainment of his \*\*\*\*\*.

The third and last, though not least eminent in the *group*, is Mr. Wm. Thompson an *ingenious and worthy schoolmaster* in Carlisle.

Each, as it may be supposed, had his particular department allotted him. It was the *late Surgeon's* business to instruct Hugh Sutherland the *barber*, and *Mary his spouse*, not only what to say, but what to conceal, and in this manner he collected and furnished the materials; these materials were in part arranged and digested by the *learned Doctor*; but it was the province of the Schoolmaster, as being better acquainted with the rules of grammar, and the arts of composition, to revise, correct, and smooth the language, and in short to give it that *elegant and polished dress*, with which it has made its appearance in the world.

So much for the State of Facts previous to its delivery from the press.

The first observation that must strike any one who is not acquainted with the circumstances which have preceded its publication is, that this must be the first time Dr. Heysham has been *thus courteously addressed* by Mr. Hodgson. To undeceive such, it may be necessary to inform them and the Public, that this is neither the first, the second, nor the third time that Mr. Hodgson has *wantonly attempted, in the most malicious and hostile manner, to ruin my character*. But hitherto all his attacks have availed him little, they have been nothing more than "the barking of a cur without its bite; the reptile's "swell without its sting; or the hissing of the viper without its venom."

From each of his assaults, which he vainly and wickedly hoped would have overwhelmed me with infamy and disgrace, I have obtained, what is my *utmost ambition, and what will be ever dear to me*, the praise and approbation of *good men*.

To convince my readers of the truth of what I have advanced, I shall now acquaint them with the particulars which occurred relative to this business, not only in the Monthly Committees, but also at the General Meetings of the Governors of the Carlisle Dispensary.

On the 7th of May Mr. Hodgson attended the Monthly Committee\*, and altho' he knew I was at Lancaster, yet with his *usual candour*, he took the advantage of my absence; he then insinuated many things to my prejudice, and misrepresented the affair concerning Hugh Sutherland, in such a manner as to leave a disagreeable but transitory impression against me, on the minds of some of the Gentlemen of the Committee; they however had too much regard for their character to enter upon the business during my absence, and properly recommended him to drop it until my return†.

On my return from Lancaster, Mr. Watson, who was Apothecary to the Dispensary at that time, told me what had passed in the Committee about Sutherland, I therefore instantly

---

*benefit of his friends and mankind in general. It is thought he never kept a secret, however delicate or important, longer than till he had an opportunity of revealing it. His only foible seems to be too much credulity, by which he is often exposed to the impertinence of swags.*

\* At this Committee the following Gentlemen were present, viz. Mr. Milbourne, Mr. Ellwood, Mr. Mitchinson, and Mr. Elliot. Mr. Milbourne was in the Chair.

† He also on that day accused me of total ignorance in Surgery and Anatomy, and instanced the case of Ann Liddell in proof of it; but this circumstance I only became acquainted with since the Anniversary Meeting, which was on the 23d of July.

instantly prepared myself, *for much preparation was not necessary*, to meet him on that subject at the next Committee, which was to be held on the 4th of June. On that day he made his appearance, and instead of confining himself to the case of Hugh Sutherland, as in justice he ought to have done, he accused me in the most *unquivocal, direct, and positive terms* of various crimes and misdemeanors, which were reduced to three general heads, viz. *great ignorance in Surgery and Anatomy; great negligence; and great cruelty to the patients recommended to my care.* And while he was loading me in a very *lavish manner*, with the most degrading and opprobrious epithets to be found in the English language, he was *not sparing of those encomiums* which he *fondly imagined belonged to himself*; often did he celebrate his own knowledge and abilities with loud and reiterated *self approbation*, and in a tone of exultation, which at that time excited laughter, said "*I shine as a Surgeon, and the world has long known it.*"

He now denies that he ever charged me with being guilty of cruelty to the patients recommended to my care; but it is usual with him to assert and deny the same thing on the same day, nay even in the same hour; and I believe he would be glad to get clear of the charge of ignorance too, but I appeal to the Gentlemen of the Committee if what I now state is not exactly true.—I may be ignorant—Mr. Hodgson has said so—I may have been negligent—Perhaps some of his affidavit-*women* may have told him so—But cruelty—I spurn the imputation—I cannot even give Mr. HODGSON credit for this—it must have come from the OLD ACCUSER OF THE BRETHREN. Thank God I have a heart which can feel for another's woe.

To answer these accusations, which were not the effect of a *sudden impulse of passion*, but the offspring of *cool and malevolent deliberation*, for he had them all ready upon paper, I was totally unprepared (if *innocence* is ever unprepared) to WARD OFF THE FALSE AND MALICIOUS ACCUSATIONS OF THE BASE.—I answered him immediately, and proved to the full and entire satisfaction of the Committee\*, by the testimony of Mr. Watson and Mr. Bell; by the evidence of the Daily Report Book of the Dispensary, that instead of being cruel I had been humane; instead of being negligent I had been attentive; and instead of being ignorant that it was HE only who thought me so.

When I had finished my defence † we both retired, and the Committee unanimously ordered the following resolution to be entered in their Minute Book, in order that it might be publicly read at the next General Meeting which was to be held on the 2d of July.

"The Monthly Committee, having examined the Books of the Dispensary, *think themselves obliged to give their thanks to Dr. Heysham for his diligence and attention to the Patients recommended to his care* ‡." After

---

\* The following Gentlemen composed the Committee on this day, viz. the 4th of June: Joseph Liddell, Esq; J. F. Clarke, Esq; Wm. Hodgson, Esq; Mr. Mitchinson, Mr. Milbourne, and Mr. Foster. Joseph Liddell, Esq; in the Chair. Several of these Gentlemen were Mr. Hodgson's warm friends; and I will venture to say he had no enemy but himself.

† The note ‡ page 6, and \* page 13 and 14 of the Observations on the Bills of Mortality for the year 1782 made a part of my defence; and every fact there mentioned was substantiated by the clearest and most conclusive evidence, except using the word Larvæ for Larva. I was not acquainted with the substance of note † page 14 at that time.

‡ See page 7 of the Minute Book, in which the proceedings of the Charity are regularly entered. This book is in the possession of Mr. Elliot, who will shew it to any person who may entertain the least doubt of the authenticity of the extracts from it.



After a patient and attentive hearing, both of the accuser and the accused, this was the solemn decision of six respectable Gentlemen, whose characters are above the imputation of being swayed by any mean or ungenerous motives; it was a decision sufficiently flattering *to me*, and tho' it is evident the Committee behaved with the utmost tenderness and delicacy towards my adversary, in order to give him an opportunity of resigning with the least possible disgrace, yet sufficiently mortifying *to him*; and if he had been possessed of the least *degree of sensibility* he would have instantly resigned; his resignation was what they expected; the propriety, the necessity of it was urged to him in the strongest and most forcible manner, again and again, by his best and sincerest friend: All Mr. Mitchinson's arguments and intreaties were however in vain; *big with his own importance*, and intent upon *my ruin*, he resolved to continue near me; but as an open attack had not been attended with success, he changed his plan of operations, and now began to stab in the dark with more than ambiguous insinuations. Where ever he could gain attention he represented *me as a dangerous person*, and tho' ignorant in my profession, yet artful, faithless, and designing. He was continually *prying* into the books of the Dispensary, took partial extracts from them, and produced these as proofs of my incapacity, and even imputed to me some trifling errors of *another*. To counteract these suggestions I published those notes in the Observations on the Bills of Mortality, by which I told the world and him, "*Jam vides, me tibi non inimicum sed hostem.*"

At the General Meeting of the Governors of the Dispensary on the 2d of July the above resolution was read; and the Governors, many of whom were now acquainted with what had passed in the Committee, thought a more general and public mark of their approbation was necessary, accordingly it was unanimously resolved:

"That public thanks be given to Dr. Heysham at the Anniversary Meeting, for his "diligence and great attention to the patients recommended to his care\*."

I now come to Friday the 22d of August, when "A General Meeting of the Governors of the Carlisle Dispensary was held in the Town Hall," (to which General Meeting Mr. Hodgson appealed) "to enquire into the merits of some disputes subsisting "between Dr. Heysham, and Mr. Hodgson Surgeon to the Dispensary." The proceedings of which it is my intention to relate.

The Meeting was respectable not only on account of the number, but from the rank, the abilities, and integrity of the Members who composed it. At this Meeting every charge against me contained in the State of Facts, and many others which Mr. Hodgson has since thought prudent to suppress, were fully and amply discussed; the same personages who now figure on paper upon oath, viz. Hugh Sutherland, Mary Sutherland, Wm. Cowin, Dorothy Wright, and Mary Blackburn, were all assembled in the Town Hall, and delivered their respective evidence.

Every favour, every indulgence, which my accuser had a right either to expect or demand, was granted him, and if any partiality was shewn it was a partiality towards him. He was full five hours in delivering his charges against me, and it was very near ten o'clock at night before he had finished. During the whole time he was heard, not only with patience and attention, but every Gentleman seemed anxious to investigate the truth; and when the poor fellow appeared unable to sum up his evidence *it was ably and impartially done for him*†.

About

\* Minute Book, page 9.

† He read all his charges and the questions which he asked his witnesses.

About ten o'clock I began my defence, and at half past eleven, when I had finished nearly about two thirds of it, the Meeting, being fully satisfied, desired me to sit down. I acquiesced with reluctance; yet in that short period I had fully confuted all my accuser's charges; first, either by his own witnesses, (most of whom but too evidently appeared to be suborned) on their cross examination; or, secondly, by the testimony of Mr. Blain, Mr. Watson, Mr. Bell, and Mr. Hinde Mr. Blain's apprentice; and, lastly, by the evidence of the Daily Report Book of the Dispensary, and in the case of Hugh Sutherland, by Mr. Blain's Day Book; in short, the following Resolution, which was dictated by the Right Hon. the Earl of Surrey, the President, was ordered to be entered in the Minute Book:

"Resolved unanimously, that Mr. Hodgson has not proved his charges against Dr. Heysham†."

*The dismissal of the Surgeon being now inevitable, a Motion for that purpose was about to be made by a Gentleman of distinguished worth and abilities, when the General Meeting chose rather to adopt the lenient measures of the Committee of the 4th of June, and adjourned to seven o'clock the following evening. But the adjournment was expressly declared to be for the purpose of giving him an opportunity of resigning, which at that time answered every purpose of an expulsion.*

From the unanimous decision of this respectable Meeting‡, who were solemnly assembled in the capacity of Judges, my adversary has thought proper to appeal to the Public.

Can it then be a matter of surprise, or uneasiness to me, to be thus attacked by a man who has so often violated the sacred name of truth; by a man, who at the same time he asperses my character, can dare to asperse the characters of so many of that respectable Meeting, by whose favour he was suffered to escape with so much lenity? For what is his State of Facts but a direct imputation of partiality in the Judges *towards me*, and a flagrant violation of justice *towards him*.

I shall make no further remarks upon the Exordium of the State of Facts, than, that it is a *piece of elegant composition*, but come to the bottom of the first page, where my adversary seems to entertain some doubts whether any advantages can be derived from the publication of Observations on the Bills of Mortality. As it would be great arrogance for me to contend with Mr. Hodgson, on a subject *with which he is so intimately acquainted*, I shall only refer my readers to *Percival's Ess.* vol. II. and to the conclusion of Dr. Monro's letter in the Appendix, No. II.

Little

---

† Minute Book, page 12.

‡ The following Gentlemen were present at the Meeting: The Right Hon. the Earl of Surrey, President; the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Clonfert, Wm. Dacre, Esq; Joseph Liddell, Esq; and John Losh, Esq; Vice Presidents; John Christian, Esq; Timothy Featherstonehaugh, Esq; Thomas Pattinson, Esq; J. F. Clarke, Esq; John Grier, Esq; John Gaff, Esq; Thomas Coulthard, Esq; Wm. Hodgson, Esq; Rev. Wm. Paley, Archdeacon of Carlisle; Rev. Mr. Bird; Rev. Mr. Dickinson; Mr. Ferguson; Mr. Graham, Newbiggin; Mr. Thomas Hodgson; Mr. Blain; Mr. Mitchel; Mr. Donald; Mr. Mitchinson; Mr. Thomas Monkhouse; Mr. George Monkhouse; Mr. Milliken, Mr. Elliot, Mr. Beck, &c. &c. &c.

Little need be said about Mr. Hodgson's *polite and civil behaviour* towards me, and still less concerning his promise of "*setting me in a favourable point of view to any who should chuse to call upon me.*"

The next long paragraph contains *many misrepresentations and falsehoods*; but, as the whole of it is in a great measure foreign to the subject in question\*, I shall not take up much of my readers time in refuting it. Most of the Governors are now acquainted with *the dissingenuous arts* † by which he obtained his election, and not many are ignorant of his *uncandid and illiberal behaviour towards me* on that occasion; a behaviour, which, however, at the earnest solicitation of one of his friends, I not only forgave but had almost forgot.

The whole of the paragraph near the top of the fifth page, from the word *wherein* to *pamphlet*, (here I must intreat my readers to excuse me from quoting the passages at length which I mean to contradict) is a direct falsehood; and I flatter myself, those who know me best, will not suspect me of being either so foolish, or so wicked, as to solemnly assert that to be false, which if true, I might acknowledge without shame, or the imputation of ignorance; for of what consequence is it who suggested the idea of opening the Antrum Maxillare, but

"Little things seem great to little men."

If any person suggested the idea to me it was Mr. Massey, a person I never spoke to in my life; the circumstances are these, about the middle of last April a Lady told me that Ann Liddell continued extremely ill, and that she understood Mr. Massey was going to cut her, or perform some operation, and that she was afraid he might do her harm; she at that time desired me to take her under my care again in the Dispensary. I told her she should be immediately admitted, and by way of experiment we would open the Antrum, which was the operation, I imagined, (but without knowing it for certain) Mr. Massey intended to perform. Whether I claimed any merit or not, from, as I have said before, one of the simplest operations in Surgery, may be gathered from my own words in the history of the patient's case, "*By way of experiment*, but without any *sanguine hopes of success*, I ordered the Antrum to be perforated‡.

The following is the substance of the conversation between Mr. Watson and me in the conference alluded to. Mr. Watson, in that conference, very much doubted whether

Mr.

\* Mr. Hodgson has forgot *his cruel behaviour* to a lady of delicate feelings and great sensibility, and the effects which it produced, otherwise he would have recollected that I offended him by representing the propriety of making an apology for what he had done. This circumstance was *after I had saved his life*, but some years before *the death of Mr. Graham*. He also forgets that I offended him by refusing to attend "*a meeting of the faculty*," which he proposed to call, about a dispute which he had with another Surgeon in Carlisle; wherein, from his own account, he evidently appeared to be wrong. Upon this occasion I gave him the most friendly advice.

† His industry on the canvass was certainly laudable; he rode night and day, flew from one part of the county to another, with astonishing rapidity; and wherever he thought that one Gentleman had influence over another, he took care to tell the latter that the former was his friend. Thus he stated to several Governors that Mr. ——— was his warm friend, and had promised to support him, altho' that Gentleman had by no means done so.

‡ Observations on the Bills of Mortality for the year 1782, page 6.



Mr. Hodgson would be able to perforate the Antrum properly or not, I told him the operation was so easy, that he could scarcely make any blunder; but, in order effectually to prevent it, I desired him to examine Dr. Monro's Lectures on Saigery, a copy of which he had. The copy was produced; and with some difficulty (for there was no index) we found directions for perforating the Antrum.

The next day I called at Mr. Hodgson's, with an intention of informing him, that Ann Liddell was soon to be admitted a Patient, and that the Antrum was to be perforated; but he was from home, so that he did not know my intentions till the next day. The 24th of April at length arrived, when Mr. Hodgson, Mr. Watson, Mr. Graham, and myself, went to the patient's house to perform the operation. The patient was placed in a proper position, and upon opening her mouth it appeared that all the Dentes Molares or Grinders had been extracted long before†. When Mr. Hodgson was going to perforate the cavity, it appeared clearly to be his intention to make the perforation too far back in the mouth, and consequently too near the posterior end of the Antrum; upon which I said, "I think you are going too far back, Mr. Hodgson; the opening should not be made farther back than where the last tooth but one had been." He immediately answered that "the opening was to be made from the socket of the last Molar Tooth, and that Dr. Monro expressly ordered it to be done so in his Lectures." I told him in a very gentle manner "he was mistaken, for I had read Dr. Monro's Lectures on the subject but two or three days before‡.

He then perforated the Jaw with the Trocar, rather nearer the corner of the mouth than he first proposed, and after the Trocar was withdrawn, he introduced another instrument, I believe of his own invention, but with what intention neither Mr. Watson or myself were able to discover; at least no object was obtained, for he took it out again without accomplishing any one circumstance whatever; and afterwards proposed to introduce a small silver Canula. I told him "a piece of Gentian Root would answer much better, as the Canula would not stay in the orifice. "I warrant it will," said he. He then attempted to introduce it, and with great difficulty did so; but before he had taken his fingers out of the patient's mouth the Canula dropped out of the orifice; and he was then satisfied the Gentian Root would be preferable, and it was afterwards introduced. In this manner the operation was performed, and I never said a word about it to any person, except Mr. Watson, until he introduced the subject before the Committee.

Having accurately and truly related the particulars which occurred in the patient's house, I shall now state the proceedings on this business before the Committee on the 4th of June||, which was about five weeks after the operation, and when the circumstances attending it, were fresh in every one's memory. On that day, among many other things, he brought forward the case of Ann Liddell, "here" said he "the Doctor has proved himself grossly ignorant in Surgery and Anatomy; for when I was perforating the Antrum from the socket of the last Molar Tooth, he advised me to make the opening "no further back in the Jaw than the last Tooth but one." I admitted that he had stated my directions to him properly, but contended that they were agreeable to the directions of Dr. Monro, and immediately called upon Mr. Watson, who declared to the

Com-

† Observations on the Bills of Mortality for 1782, page 5.

‡ Compare this account with my letter to Dr. Monro in the Appendix, No. I.

|| See note ~, page 5.

Committee, "that Dr. Monro recommended the last Tooth but one to be drawn, and "the perforation to be made from its socket".

Mr. Bell, who had left Edinburgh about a month before, and had been attending Dr. Monro's Lectures, was next called. He declared "that he particularly remembered "what Dr. Monro had said upon the subject, and that so far from his advising the "opening to be made from the socket of the last tooth, he advised the last tooth but two, "or the third Molar to be drawn, which he said was the center Tooth." After these two Gentlemen had delivered their evidence, one of the Members of the Committee got up, and said, "Mr. Hodgson you should not accuse Dr. Heysham of ignorance, you "should go to Edinburgh and instruct Dr. Monro." To this he made no answer, but hung down his head, and I believe for the first and last time exhibited some symptoms of a sense of shame.

If this be a true state of the case, how are we to account for Dr. Monro's approbation of Mr. Hodgson's mode of operating? The answer is short but convincing, because Mr. Hodgson stated the case, so far as it relates to the Tooth which ought to be drawn, in his letter to Dr. Monro, exactly in the same manner as I had advised him to perform the operation, viz. *from the fourth Molar Tooth*, which is no other but *the last Tooth but one*. Nay, I will even grant that Mr. Hodgson had consulted Dr. Monro's Lectures before he performed the operation. How then, it will be asked, could he say that I had recommended him to do it in an improper manner? because he did not know how *many Molar Teeth or Grinders were even in his own head*. He thought there were only four on each side of each Jaw, hence the *fourth must be the last*; but unfortunately for him it happens that there are *five Molar Teeth*, and that the *fifth is the last*, and the *fourth consequently the last Tooth but one*. In this state of ignorance he remained until he arrived at Edinburgh†; he there found a *Tooth in his head* with which he was *totally unacquainted*, called the *Dens Sapientie, or Tooth of Wisdom*, from its coming through the gums ‡ between the age of 15 and 21. But *this Tooth*, it seems, did not make its appearance in Mr. Hodgson until he was between 30 and 40 years of age.

In consequence of the operation being made so far back in the month, and *so near the posterior end of the Antrum*, it was impossible to examine the inside of the cavity, either with the eye, or with proper instruments; the insects also had a considerable space to lodge in; hence we see the first insect was not discharged till the 5th, the second not till the 8th, and the third, which came away piece meal, was not wholly discharged until the 27th or 28th day after the operation was performed||. Whereas if the perforation had

---

\* As I do not mean to follow Mr. Hodgson's plan of suppressing the most material facts, it may be necessary to mention, that Mr. Watson's evidence before the Committee was not exactly the same he delivered in the General Meeting on the 22d of August; that difference, however, I think may be accounted for. Mr. Hodgson, almost immediately after he arrived from Edinburgh, took a ride over to Allendale where Mr. Watson resides, and which is near forty miles from Carlisle, in order to prepare him, and refresh his memory; and he also saw him on the very morning of the Meeting.

† On the 6th of August Mr. Hodgson set out for Edinburgh, (altho' he declared in the most express terms to the Committee that he was going to Moffat) and did not return till the 15th or 16th.

‡ See Monro's Anatomy, page 156.

|| See Observations on the Bills of Mortality for 1782, page 7 and 8.

had been made properly, viz. in the center of the Antrum, it is more than probable they would have been immediately brought away by the injection, or we should have had an opportunity of extracting them with a proper instrument.

In the Observations on the Bills of Mortality, it is said, Mr. Hodgson hawked the insects about the town, country, &c. &c. which I here in the fullest manner acknowledge to be erroneous, and this acknowledgment I should have made altho' the certificate of Ann Liddell, Sarah Sewell, and Isabella Porter, had never been published. Instead of the word Larvæ I ought to have used Larva, viz. in the singular number, for in truth he only hawked one insect about the town and country; and that he did so I think nobody doubts. The first insect was discharged on the 28th of April, and was not sent to the Dispensary till about noon on the 2d of May; and I imagine it would never have been sent if Mr. Mitchinson had not pointed out to my adversary the necessity of such a measure. I shall now state the evidence which appeared both before the Committee on the 4th of June, and the General Meeting on the 22d of August.

Mr. Watson declared at both these Meetings, "that he had gone to Mr. Hodgson's house several times, at my particular request\*, in order to get the insect; that one time he found Mr. Hodgson in his stable, who had the insect in his pocket, and refused to send it; that another time he was informed by some of Mr. Hodgson's apprentices, that Mr. H. had taken the insect with him into the country; and a third time that Mr. H. was gone to Capt. Knubley's, and had taken the insect along with him." This evidence Mr. Hodgson heard in the Committee, and did not attempt to contradict it; therefore it was considered as true, not only by myself, but I believe by all the Gentlemen of the Committee. And that it was shewn in the town was so notorious†, that, I think I may almost without a figure say, the whole town had seen it. Nay so early as the 29th of April a drawing had been made of it by some of the Stampery Boys; and if any person is anxious to know *what country people* saw it before it was sent to the Dispensary, he may be fully satisfied by making proper enquiry in the parishes of Sebergham, Burgh, and Orton.

Why Mr. Hodgson obtained a certificate from Miss Waugh and Miss Betty, in preference to the hundreds who had seen it I cannot tell, but I am very certain when the *note* was written I did not know that he had taken it to their house.—Nor was it declared, as Mr. H. asserts in the State of Facts, at the General Meeting, that it had been shewn at Finland Rigg‡. A Gentleman, to whom Mr. H. behaved with great illiberality, stated what evidence had appeared, concerning the insect, before the Committee; and which was not refuted, or even contradicted, and therefore believed.

I shall dismiss this subject with putting one question to Mr. Hodgson. What could be *his reason* for keeping the insect four or five days in his possession? perhaps no better answer can be given than to a brother physician when he gravely asked, *What reason* Mr. Dacre's horse had for not winning the race at Bassenthwaite?

The case of Hugh Sutherland naturally presents itself again; and here I think I may venture to assert, that Mr. Hodgson is the first *shining Surgeon*, who disregarding the little prejudices of the world, and from motives, no doubt *purely humane*, publishes upon oath too, his own inability to perform an operation, which in the Committee, he represented as "extremely easy, and requiring little dexterity or anatomical knowledge."

\* Mr. Clarke was twice present when I sent him.

† Some of the Gentlemen at the Committee had seen it

‡ State of Facts, page 5.

On this subject it may be necessary to observe, that the following facts were stated by me in the Observations on the Bills of Mortality\*.

1. That Hugh Sutherland is a very infirm man, and had not for many years been able to retain a *gill of urine in his bladder at any one time.*

2. That he laboured under a suppression of urine, and Mr. Hodgson attempted to draw off his water, but introduced the Catheter in a *very awkward manner*, and would not follow my advice.

3. That Mr. Hodgson was upwards of *twenty minutes* in attempting to introduce that instrument, but could not do it, put the patient to a *great deal of pain*, and brought away *nothing but blood.*

4. That Mr. Hodgson alledged there was “*an evident obstruction in the Urethra.*”

5. That the urine drawn off, without difficulty by Mr. Blain, was measured, and exceeded three pints.

6. That Mr. Blain drew off the patient's urine *three times on the 24th of February*, and drew off each time near three pints.

7. That Mr. Blain frequently introduced Mr. Creighton's Catheters, and that one of them remained in the patient's bladder *twenty-four hours.*

8. That Mr. Hodgson had been guilty of a *deliberate falsehood*, which he *obstinately persisted in* for upwards of *three months.*

The greatest part of the 1st was so evident to every one, who had an opportunity of seeing the patient, that Mr. Hodgson, with all his *effrontery*, has not dared to contradict it. He is not, however, so delicate with respect to the 2d, but asserts it to be altogether false, and has prevailed upon Hugh Sutherland and his wife to swear that it is so. I, on the contrary, maintain what I have said to be true, and I flatter myself the generality of my readers will think a deaf † person who swears that his urine was only drawn off twice in an afternoon, tho' it was really drawn off three times, will be able to give a very imperfect account of the conversation, &c. which passed between me and my adversary, and particularly at a time when he was afflicted with the most excruciating pain, unless his memory had been *refreshed with frequent instructions.*

The *third*, Mr. Hodgson flatly contradicts, and both the patient and his wife have sworn that it is false. They have all reduced the *twenty minutes* to *four*: the reduction is great, and if true, wonderful; for can it be supposed that Mr. Hodgson, the “*expert and experienced Surgeon*‡” would have given up the matter so soon, and have suffered the

\* Observations, page 13 and 14.

† He appeared to be so deaf in the Town-Hall on the 22d of August, that it was with great difficulty I could make him hear the questions which I asked him.

‡ State of Facts, page 6. When I first read the passage, which contains *these four words*, I imagined Mr. H. had intended to pay a compliment to some of his friends, but it has since, however, appeared to me clear, that he applies those epithets to *himself*; and why should I have doubted it, for HE, who can say, in the presence of nine Gentlemen, “*I shine as a Surgeon*,” may, without *much vanity*, tell the world that “*he is an expert and experienced Surgeon.*” Here also an asterisk directs me to the bottom of the page, where I find two celebrated Surgeons, who have been long in the grave, brought as witnesses against me. It is the first time they ever appeared in so *forry* a business. What are



the *lustre of his character to be tarnished by the success of a rival*, most assuredly not, he certainly would have persevered another *minute*, and made it *five*; for my part I think Mr. Hodgson, who tells us he is "as careful of other people's characters as his own," would have persevered in the attempt even longer, viz. *ten minutes*; and that he did so I think may be concluded both from his own account, and the testimony of his witnesses. Hugh and Mary Sutherland declared in the Town-Hall, that Mr. Hodgson came to their house about *twelve o'clock*, and Mr. Blain about *one*.

They have since both sworn that he came "about half past twelve o'clock\*," and Mr. Blain declares upon oath† it was after one before he was desired to attend‡. It is, therefore, evident Mr. Hodgson was *full half an hour* with the patient, and if he was only *four minutes* in attempting to introduce the Catheter, an obvious question occurs, viz. What was he doing during the *remaining twenty-six minutes*? For I solemnly declare I went for, and *literally ran to*, Mr. Blain the moment Mr. Hodgson had given *the matter up*, and proposed *to leave the poor man to his fate*, and Mr. Blain || returned with me immediately; how then, I say, did he employ his time? if we examine the Appendix, No. VI. we shall not remain long in the dark; Hugh Sutherland himself, and I am certain he had great reason to be acquainted with the affair, will inform us. What does he say? he tells us, "that Mr. Hodgson was *upwards of twenty minutes* in attempting to introduce the "Catheter, and that he brought away *nothing but blood*, and put him to a *great deal of "pain*." This accounts, in a rational manner, how Mr. H. employed his time during the half hour, and at the same time proves, that his labour was not altogether in vain, for two objects were accomplished by it, viz. *a free discharge of blood*, and a considerable *degree of pain*.

The *fourth*, my adversary, has either admitted, or not thought proper to contradict; but as every thing that he admits may be doubted, I shall prove the truth of it by Mr. Blain, who declares that Mr. H. told him soon after he had entered the patient's room, "that § there was such an obstruction in the Urethra as rendered it impossible to take "off the water." And again, "there is the obstruction," and in an instant the instrument entered the man's bladder. What then *my friend*, for you "have still the happiness "of being on a good footing with all the Physicians in town," were your sensations at so unexpected but so wished for an event? Did not your eye, the index of the soul, *sparkle with joy*? Was it not, tell me candidly, and do not be bashful, *the happiest moment of your life*? You indeed had reason to rejoice that HIS life should be saved, who has since proved so steady, and yet so complying a friend, who will not only say, but swear whatever you desire.

And if there was an obstruction in the Urethra, my good friend, which rendered it impossible to introduce the Catheter, the Catheter was not to blame; and I am certain  
you

---

are they made to tell us? what every old wife must know, viz. that a Catheter proper for a stout man must be too large for a little boy! *A goose knows a gander from a gosling*. But perhaps the late Surgeon, in his defence may say, it was the learned Physician who recommended and insisted on this note being introduced,

\* See State of Facts, page 12.

† See Appendix, No. IV.

‡ Mr. Blain was at dinner when I went for him.

|| See Appendix, No. IV.

§ See Appendix, No. IV.

you have too much regard for the reputation even of a Catheter \* to have traduced it at that time; recollect and do justice to your own candour, and I am certain you will acknowledge you found no fault with the instrument until "the evident obstruction in the Urethra" was removed. But if the Catheters had been *too crooked or too straight*, or you had really thought them so, would not you, who have been so often accustomed to borrow, have gone out, and borrowed another, rather than have permitted Mr. Blain to come and interfere in your practice. If you had done so, I dare say Mr. Blain would not have refused you. But enough, the matter has been urged too far, should I proceed your delicacy, I am afraid, will be offended.

\* The *fifth*, is also flatly denied by Mr. Hodgson, and he is supported by the oaths both of the patient and his wife, (for whatever the first says the other two swear to) who declare † that it was not measured, tho' at the General Meeting they acknowledged I did measure it the next day. I was not present when Mr. Blain drew off the water the next day; but immediately after it had been first drawn off on the 24th, either Hugh's wife, or another person, went out of the house, at my request to borrow a measure, which was soon procured, and I measured the urine myself in the presence of Mr. Blain and Mr. Hodgson; and Mr. Blain testifies upon oath that he saw it measured that day ‡. There was about three pints, and an ounce or two ounces. I particularly remember, that, in pouring out the urine from the chamber-pot into the measure, part of it fell upon my left hand.

¶ We have hitherto been disputing about trifles, what immediately follows is of the most serious and solemn nature, it is no less than direct and wilful perjury either in one of the parties or the other.

Mr. Hodgson positively contradicts || the *sixth*, and asserts that Hugh Sutherland's urine was only twice drawn off on the 24th of February, viz. at one o'clock in the afternoon, and at seven o'clock in the evening. Hugh and his wife, as usual, exactly swear § what the other has asserted, viz. that the urine was only drawn off twice that day, viz. "at one o'clock, and about seven in the evening."

Is it possible that a man, who, in the situation that Hugh was then in, could recollect such minute and trifling circumstances as he pretends to have done, and yet should forget that a Catheter was introduced into his bladder; should forget, that by the introduction of that Catheter, he was relieved from a dangerous and painful disorder? Is it possible that the patient's wife, who declares she was never absent from her husband, and who also pretends to have a perfect remembrance of the most trivial matters, should forget so remarkable an occurrence? If then the patient's urine was drawn off three times on that day are not these two persons guilty of a crime, which has been held in the utmost detestation in every age and in every country in the world? That it was drawn off three times is now my business to prove.

In the first place Mr. Blain has declared upon oath ††, that he drew off the patient's urine three times on the 24th of February, viz. about one o'clock, and again about four

---

\* I will venture to say Mr. Creighton's Catheters are as good as ever were used.

† See State of Facts, page 13.

‡ See Appendix, No. IV.

|| State of Facts, page 6.

§ State of Facts, page 13.

†† Appendix, No. IV.

four o'clock in the afternoon, and a third time about seven o'clock in the evening.

In the second place Robert Hinde, Mr. Blain's apprentice, has also declared upon oath \* that he twice accompanied his master to Hugh Sutherland's house on the 24th of February, viz. at four o'clock in the afternoon, and about seven o'clock in the evening, and saw him draw off near three pints of the patient's urine each time.

To this testimony I shall add the evidence of two Day Books, than which nothing can be stronger, or more convincing, as they were written at the time when the circumstances occurred; at a time when it was impossible to foresee that any dispute would happen; they were written by different persons, who had not the least idea of what each other did.

In the Daily Report Book of the Dispensary, page 91, it is expressly mentioned that Hugh Sutherland's urine was drawn off three times on the 24th of February, 1783<sup>d</sup>, and the same fact is entered in Mr. Blain's Day Book on the 24th of February. Both Books were produced, read, and examined at the General Meeting on the 22d of August. After thus stating the evidence to make any comments would be to insult my readers.

We now come to the *seventh*, which Mr. Hodgson makes no scruple to contradict; for having got *into a habit of lying*, he finds it difficult, on the most trifling matters, *to speak truth*.

What does Mr. Blain say, who may be supposed to be acquainted with this circumstance? He informs us that "he frequently introduced Mr. Creighton's Catheter, and "always with the same ease as his own†;" and the apprentice says, he "saw Mr. Blain frequently draw off Hugh Sutherland's urine with Mr. Creighton's Catheters, "one

\* Appendix. No. V.

† Mr. Watson, the Apothecary, who took down Hugh Sutherland's case, was never present when the urine was drawn off on the 24th of February; and the case was not taken till the morning of the 25th, when neither Mr. Blain nor myself were present; therefore whatever the case contains he must have had from the information of Hugh or his wife. What relates to the affair under consideration is as follows: "His urine was "drawn off with the Catheter about ten o'clock, about four o'clock, and again in the "evening about seven o'clock, and about three pounds every time." With respect to the first time, specified in the case, there is an evident error, for we all agree that it was not drawn off till one o'clock; how this error, which, however, is of no consequence, originated I cannot tell. Hugh must either have informed him wrong, or he must have misunderstood Hugh, or he might have made a mistake in transcribing the case from the pocket book, in which it was taken down in the patient's house, into the large folio book kept at the Dispensary. The other times specified exactly agree with the times stated in the affidavits of Mr. Blain, and his apprentice; yet Mr. Watson did not know either *when or how often*, the Catheter was introduced, until he was informed by Hugh or his wife, or both; nor could he know any thing about the quantity of urine drawn off each time, but from their information; nor is it likely they could have specified the quantity unless they had seen it measured. They did see it measured the first time, and afterwards observing the chamber-pot into which the urine was drawn, nearly as full the two last times as it had been at first, they guessed the quantity pretty exactly, three pounds being the same as three pints.

‡ Appendix, No. IV.

“ one of which remained in his bladder a whole day, during which time he never heard Hugh make the least complaint, tho’ he saw him several times that day\*” To this evidence, which is perhaps too strong for Mr. Hodgson, I shall add an extract from the Report Book :

February 27, “ The Catheter was introduced about eleven o’clock yesterday morning, and has remained in his bladder ever since, and through which his urine has been gradually distilling†.”

The *eighth*, he in some measure admits; confesses he was guilty of a lie‡, which he attempts to palliate and extenuate; but in what manner? by telling a great number more. Instead of going into his parlour, &c. &c. as he states||, he told me in the street that he had lent his Catheters to Mr. Wm. Hodgson of Burgh; nor did he enter his shop until we had borrowed the instruments from Mr. Creighton; he then, I believe, stepped into the shop in order to get a little oil. If he had gone into his parlour his apprentices, his servant, or his wife, must have seen him; why then no certificate, no deposition upon oath, as upon other occasions? The reason is evident, neither his wife, his apprentices, nor his servant, would perjure themselves.

But suppose we admit that he did go into his parlour, &c. &c. when he found his instruments were not where he expected them, he would have made some enquiry before he told me positively that he had lent them to Mr. Hodgson; nor would he have permitted Mr. H. to have kept them upwards of three months. But he knew that he *had behaved in so illiberal a manner* to Mr. Hodgson, of Burgh, previous to the 24th of February, that that Gentleman would have scorned to have asked any favour of him at that time. Some tooth-drawers and a syringe were the only instruments Mr. H. of Burgh, ever borrowed of him§. Mr. Hodgson, Surgeon at Brompton, and Mr. Hodgson, of Burgh, who were both his apprentices, have declared they never remember seeing any Catheters in his possession; and Mr. Graham, who has been with him nine months, never saw one till a few days before the General Meeting on the 22d of August\*\*.

Being on the subject of instruments, I shall not dismiss it without informing my readers, that Mr. Hodgson asserted at the General Meeting that he “ was amply provided with instruments;” and in his State of Facts††, he says, “ my education has taught me the use and necessity of having every chirurgical instrument, which the present practice has authorised or adopted, &c. &c.” These are bold assertions, but he has forgot the proofs; it would be unkind in me not to supply the deficiency :

Mr.

\* Appendix, No. V.

† If the reader will compare the affidavits of Mr. Blain, Robert Hinde, and Mr. Bell, with the depositions of Hugh and Mary Sutherland, he will see much more than I am able or willing to express.

‡ He was under an absolute necessity of making the confession, for the whole circumstances were known to such a number of respectable Gentlemen, that no attempt to suborn durst be made.

|| State of Facts, greatest part of page 7.

§ Appendix, No. VIII.

\*\* After he had returned from Edinaburgh, where it is supposed he had purchased some second hand Catheters.

†† Page 7.



Mr. Hodgson has borrowed of

Mr. Blain, a seton lancet, an ear piercer, and several other instruments.  
 Mr. Creighton, catheters, trepanning instruments, and probes.  
 Mr. Losh, trepanning instruments.  
 Mr. James, a tourniquet, and his apprentice a probe.  
 Mr. Lattimer, a knife and needles.  
 Dr. Heysham, Mudge's inhaler.  
 Mrs. Graham, a probe, a catheter, and a trocar.  
 Mr. Hodgson, Brampton, a case of lancets.  
 Mr. Hodgson, Burgh, six needles\*.

He also applied to Mr. Bell for some needles, but was refused.

*Whether he ever borrowed any of Mr. Maffey I cannot tell, not being acquainted with that Gentleman.*

All these are convincing proofs that he is amply provided with instruments.

I shall now quote a passage from my adversary's State of Facts, equally beautiful and perspicuous: "The Doctor† also expatiates with some sort of pleasantry, how *sometimes* and repeatedly Mr. Blain introduced Mr. Creighton's catheters, and insists upon the honour that one of them came off with after remaining in the man's bladder twenty-four hours. What merriment this may excite in the patient will be difficult to say." And in page 4, he talks of "ill-judged ridicule, and unmeaning wit." *Sed stuporem hominis, vel dicam pecudis, attendite‡.*

Mr. Blain had saved the patient's life several months before this unmeaning wit was written. The next sentence|| is contradicted upon oath by Mr. Blain's apprentice§.

At the top of page 7, we are informed Dr. Coulthard cured the patient by a remedy. What that remedy was is unknown to many of my readers; but they will no doubt smile, when I inform them (from what was mentioned at the General Meeting) this *weak emaciated old man* was ordered to lie stretched on his back, and to be oppressed with either a hoop, a peck, or a sack of malt on his belly; and by this means his water was pressed out of his bladder. Would it not have been better to have placed him in a cheese press? I believe the fact is, that Dr. Coulthard was the first person called to the patient, but never saw him after the first day; and I am certain he has too much good sense to have ordered so preposterous an application.

I now come to the 25th of August, a remarkable period in Mr. Hodgson's practice\*\*. He then accomplished what he had never done before. On this day, for the first time, he had the honour of drawing off Hugh Sutherland's urine. He must have been a ——— indeed if he could not have done it after the lesson he had received from Mr. Blain. But how did he perform the operation? Hugh has informed us. "He had hard *WARK* at first, but got it done at last." The last time he drew it off, he "made two trials, but succeeded the second." But he did more than all this, "with

\* All these instruments are indispensably necessary, and may be had for a very trifling sum of money.

† Page 6.

‡ Cic. in M. Ant.

|| State of Facts, bottom of page 6.

§ Appendix, No. V.

\*\* State of Facts, page 7 near the bottom.

“ with the proper administration of remedies he effected a cure in three days.” How, and by what remedies? By the remedies which I had prescribed, and had sent from the Dispensary. For Mr. Bell informs us he visited Hugh on the third day of his illness, and when he was taking away the medicines, which had been sent from the Dispensary, “ Hugh desired him several times, in an anxious manner, to let them remain; “ saying, they are of much use to me, and none to you.” Mr. Bell likewise says one of the Catheters was very bloody.

Concerning Wm. Cowin it will be unnecessary to say much. I believe every Gentleman, who heard him deliver his evidence in the Town-Hall on the 22d of August, thought *him a most despicable wretch*. The material parts of his evidence were contradicted in the fullest manner by Mr. Watson, and by the Report Book of the Dispensary.

Whether Dorothy Wright, and Mary Blackburn, *the two washer-women*, have any settled purpose to deceive or not I cannot tell; but I am certain they have misrepresented the conversation I had with them in a very egregious manner, perhaps, from misunderstanding me.

A few words on the Appendix will suffice. Here I must confess my adversary has not been wanting either in artifice or cunning. The certificates of Anthony Watson, John Graham, and Wm. Hodgson, are drawn up in such general terms, that a reader unaccustomed to examine, to compare, and to reason upon facts, may be led to conclude that they authenticate the most material passages in Mr. Hodgson's publication; the contrary, however, will appear from the perusal of the certificates of John Graham, and Wm. Hodgson, in my Appendix, No. III. and VIII. These Gentlemen now explain what Mr. H. withheld might be concealed, viz. the facts with which they were acquainted. What are these facts? Mr. Graham says, “ all he knows about the matter is, that there *was a difference of opinion between Dr. Heysham and Mr. Hodgson*,” a circumstance that was always granted; and Mr. Hodgson, of Burgh, informs us he borrowed a *tooth-drawer and a syringe*, which was never denied. And if I had had leisure to ride seventy, or eighty miles, I have not the least doubt but I could have obtained a similar explanatory certificate from Mr. Watson.

My adversary in his letter to Dr. Monro, informs the Doctor, that a lady, in similar circumstances with Ann Liddell, had applied to him, and that he “ had fixed on Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday next, &c. for performing the operation†.” Permit me to ask who is this lady? where does she live? when was the operation performed? how many insects were extracted? Can you answer these questions Mr. Hodgson? or is this one of what may be called *your innocent lies*?

So much for the State of Facts and its Appendix.

If I had had time, or had thought it necessary, at the General Meeting on the 22d of August, it was my intention, by way of retaliation, to have acted for once *on the offensive*, and to have charged Mr. H. with some particular circumstances *tending to illustrate his character*, part of which I shall now briefly relate.

Mr. Hodgson recommended one Joseph Henderson, as a proper object to the Dispensary, tho' the said Joseph Henderson is a Member of a Club, to which Club Mr. H. is  
the

\* The Appendix, No. VI. towards the latter end.

† See Appendix to State of Facts, page 10 and 11.

the Surgeon; and from which Club he receives a yearly salary\*, for giving advice and medicines to such Members as are out of health†. Thus to save himself about *three pennynorth of medicine* he perverted the object of the charity. Can a stronger proof be given of the *littleness and meanness of the man*?

Jane Hornsby, a poor woman from the country, who had a large tumour on her arm, was admitted a patient, and was anxious to have an operation immediately performed, in order that she might return to her own home as soon as possible. A consultation was held on her case on Saturday the 5th of July, when it was agreed the tumour should be removed. I proposed the operation should be performed that afternoon; no, it was market-day. On Sunday; no, Mr. Hodgson said‡, "his conscience would not permit him to do it on Sunday, he thought it was very wrong to perform operations on that day, for it gave people an opportunity of talking." "*Magna vis est conscientie.*" Great is the power of conscience! the most impious and abandoned sometimes feel its influence. Mr. H. however, felt little of that influence; for what purpose then the delay? Shall I inform my readers? it was to procure instruments. And accordingly, betwixt Saturday and Monday, the day the operation was performed, he borrowed of Mr. James, Surgeon in Carlisle, a tourniquet; of Mr. Lattimer, Surgeon at Kirkoswald, a knife and two needles; and of Mr. Hodgson, Surgeon at Burgh, a case containing about half a dozen needles. Thus prepared with the necessary instruments, he was ready on Monday to perform the operation. But how did he perform it? I dare not tell you||; all that I am allowed to say is, that if Mr. Jackson, my Farrier, had taken off a like tumour from my horse, in a similar manner, I should never have employed him again. When the operation was finished, Mr. Blain, Mr. Creighton, Mr. Bell, Mr. Hodgson, and myself came up to the Dispensary§, where I entered a report in the book, which I read to all the Gentlemen, purporting, that in consequence of Mr. Hodgson's leaving no skin to cover

---

\* He receives annually about eight or ten pounds for attending, &c. &c. the Members of the Club. I have been informed Mr. Hodgson denies, for he will deny any thing, having recommended this person; and prevailed upon him to say that he never received a letter of recommendation from Mr. H. which is in part true, for Mr. H. did not give him a letter, but desired me to admit him and his father at the same time, saying he had no letter, or words to that effect. They were both accordingly admitted on the 24th of March, and entered in the Dispensary Book in my own hand writing in the name of Mr. Hodgson, Surgeon. Mr. H. also desired me, at the same time, to admit one John Searson, who, I believe, lived with Henderson; and as he could only recommend two patients at a time, I entered this man in the name of Mr. Pattinson. See Entry Book, p. 12, No. 255, 256, and 257.

† See Minute Book, page 11.

‡ Mr. Blain was present when he expressed, in the most *canting hypocritical manner*, these scruples of conscience.

|| Altho' this patient had an exceeding good constitution, yet it was forty-eight days before her arm was healed. Had the operation been performed as any Surgeon would have done it, viz. left as much skin as would have covered the surface of the wound, I have not the least doubt but she would have been perfectly well in the space of ten days.

§ All these Gentlemen were present when the operation was performed.

cover the surface of the wound, the cure would be considerably retarded. Upon which, with the utmost effrontery, he asserted over and over again in the strongest terms, that he "had left as much skin as perfectly covered the surface of the wound." Mr. Creighton, Mr. Blain, and Mr. Bell were astonished and confounded! I call this one of Mr. H's. *bold and audacious lies*. The wound was afterwards dressed in the presence of the same Gentlemen; its size was measured, and it proved to be upwards of *three inches in diameter*, which was considerably broader than the base of the tumour\*.

I have now done with Mr. Hodgson. He perhaps may write again, "to maintain *his just possession*†;" but the world will recollect that "*stubborn audacity is the last refuge of guilt*."

CARLISLE, *October 10th*, 1783.

---

\* See Dispensary Report Book, page 8 and 20.

† State of Facts, last line, page 8.



# A P P E N D I X.

## No. I.

DEAR SIR,

*Carlisle, July 24th, 1783.*

INCLOSED is a copy of Observations on the Bills of Mortality in Carlisle for the year 1782, which I hope you will do me the honour to accept. They contain a case of a very singular nature, both with respect to the violence and duration of the pain, and also with respect to the insects which were discharged. This case has given rise to a silly dispute between one Hodgson, a Surgeon in this place, and myself; and concerning which I understand he has wrote to you. I am sensible it must be disagreeable to you to interfere in such cases; but if you have answered his letter I flatter myself you will indulge me with the same favour, as that matter, with some others, will be discussed at a General Meeting of the Subscribers to the Carlisle Dispensary about the middle of next month. The dispute is simply this: When he was going to perforate the Antrum I advised him to make the perforation no farther back than the place where the last tooth but one had been. He told me Dr. Monro gave express directions to make the perforation from the socket of the last or farthest tooth; and afterwards accused me of total ignorance of the situation, &c. of the Antrum. In some notes of your Lectures, which are in my possession, the following direction is given, viz. "Any of the teeth in the upper jaw, under the Antrum, may be extracted, and a perforation made, which may be easily done from the fourth Dens Molaris."

In his letter he perhaps might also mention a tumour; on this business I only beg leave to ask you whether in the extirpation of a Pleatoma about two 2lb. weight, situated on the outer part of the humerus, and about three or four inches below the shoulder in a healthy subject, you would recommend a circular incision round the base of the tumour to be made in such a manner as to leave little or no skin, or you would direct the fat to be dissected out in such a manner as would leave as much skin as would cover the surface of the wound. If you think it consistent with your elevated character to trouble yourself with such trifles,

You will very much oblige,

Your very humble servant,

JOHN HEYSHAM.

P. S. I am now reading your book on the Nervous System with great pleasure and satisfaction.

*To Dr. Monro, Edinburgh.*

I certify that this is an exact copy of the letter sent to Dr. Monro.

*Oct. 9, 1783.*

ARTH. ELLIOT.

## No. II.

SIR,

TILL I received your letter and printed observations I did not know that any dispute subsisted between you and Mr. Hodgson.

F

Mr.

Mr. Hodgson wrote me a letter, dated July 21, in which he wishes to know, whether I still approve the following directions for opening into the Antrum Maxillare for the discharge of matter or insects, which, by his notes, he finds I proposed when he attended my Course of Lectures.

“ Your orders are to draw the fourth Molaris, and to pass a Trocar directly upwards, through the socket, into the Antrum: But if a patient should not submit to have a tooth extracted, or if they have already been extracted, and the sockets obliterated, you may pierce, into the cavity, on the outside of the jaw, just above the said tooth, and, to keep open the opening for the free exit of matter or insects, and to allow you to throw up an injection. To accomplish this you introduce a Silver Canula, which is to remain until the cure is perfected.”

He then mentions the case you also describe, in which he operated in a way similar to that I had advised. He says nothing of you nor of a dispute with any person.

I wrote my answer to him, as I am obliged to do this to you, in a hurry, and, not thinking it material, I kept no copy of it. But in substance I observed, that he had very fully expressed my directions in the notes he had taken from my Lectures; that I saw no occasion to make any alteration in the method I had proposed; and of course I concluded that Mr. Hodgson had performed his operation in a proper manner.

Mr. Hodgson wrote nothing about the case of Steatom; I think therefore I need say nothing about it.

I hope you will continue to publish your Observations on the Bills of Mortality; as a comparison of such Observations, made with accuracy in different places, must be attended with many advantages, general as well as local.

I am, Sir, your most humble servant,

ALEX. MONRO.

Edinburgh, July 30th, 1783.

### No. III.

Carlisle, October 4th, 1783.

I HEREBY certify that I know nothing about any of the particulars mentioned in the State of Facts, except that there was some difference of opinion between Dr. Heysham and Mr. Hodgson, when Mr. Hodgson was going to operate on Ann Liddell; but I have no recollection of the particulars of that difference of opinion. I also certify that, tho' I have attended Mr. Hodgson's shop near nine months, yet I never, during that time, saw any Catheters in Mr. Hodgson's possession till within a few days before the General Meeting on the 22d of August, when I saw two or three, which Mr. Hodgson desired might be cleaned. These, viz. the catheters and some pocket instruments are the only instruments I have ever seen in his possession. I further certify that Mr. Hodgson borrowed of my mother a silver probe, a catheter, and a trocar, with which he performed the operation on Ann Liddell.

JOHN GRAHAM.

### No. IV.

Mr. BLAIN declares, that Dr. Heysham called upon him, a little after one o'clock in the afternoon, when he was at dinner, on the 24th of February, 1783, and desired him to go to a poor man who was in great danger and distress from a suppression of urine. That

he

he took his own Catheters along with him, and went immediately with the Doctor, who conducted him to Hugh Sutherland's house. Upon his entering the room, he enquired of Mr. Hodgson, Surgeon, who was along with the patient, what was the matter.—That Mr. Hodgson told him, he had been attempting to take off Hugh Sutherland's water, but found such an obstruction in the Urethra as made it impossible, or words to that effect. At the same time Mr. Hodgson took up a Catheter, which he imagines was the same which Mr. Hodgson had been using, and offering it to Mr. Blain, said, Will you or do you try.—That Mr. Blain told him he would make use of his own Catheter, which he had been accustomed to, but did not examine the instrument which Mr. Hodgson offered him.—That he then placed the patient in a proper position, and drew off his urine without the least difficulty.—That while he was performing the operation he made a stop for a second of time or two, in order to adjust his own situation which was somewhat uneasy.—That Mr. Hodgson then said, *There is the obstruction*, and immediately afterwards the instrument entered the man's bladder; by which a very large quantity of urine was drawn off, and the patient instantly relieved.—That the urine was then measured in his presence; but cannot at this time recollect the precise quantity; but very well remembers that some person was sent out of the house to borrow a measure for that purpose.

Mr. Blain further declares that he drew off Hugh Sutherland's urine a second time that day, viz. about four o'clock in the afternoon, with his own Catheter, in the presence of his apprentice; and that he drew it off a third time the same day, about seven or eight o'clock in the evening, with Mr. Creighton's Catheter, and without the least difficulty. He thinks the urine drawn off the second time was nearly equal to what was drawn off the first time; but that the quantity drawn off the third time was somewhat less. He likewise declares, that he afterwards frequently introduced Mr. Creighton's Catheter, and always with the same ease as his own; and that he never at any one time introduced first his own, and immediately after Mr. Creighton's.—That he is of opinion Mr. Creighton's Catheters are very good ones.

And he declares that both Hugh Sutherland and his wife, (after Hugh was dismissed from the Dispensary, and was able to walk about the town) returned their thanks to him frequently, and expressed themselves in the most grateful manner, always blessing him for what he had done; acknowledging that he, Mr. Blain, had saved Hugh Sutherland's life. That Hugh Sutherland, who he understood was dismissed from the Dispensary on the 13th of March, applied to him, Mr. Blain, so late as the 26th of May, for advice and medicines; and told him he was afraid his gravelly complaint was going to return.—He accordingly gave him advice, and applied what he hoped might be of use to him. Mr. Blain further declares, that on Saturday the 23d of August, the day after the General Meeting, he went up to Mary Sutherland, Hugh's wife, who was conversing with Mr. Dixon, Attorney at Law, in the Street, and charged her in a very severe manner with asserting many falsehoods before the Governors of the Carlisle Dispensary; he also, being much agitated, told her she was guilty of perjury; to which she answered, with a smile upon her countenance, *that she was not upon her oath.*

Sworn before me, this

8th day of October,

1783,

JOS. BLAIN.

JOSEPH GILL, Mayor.

## No. V.

ROBERT HINDE, Mr. Blain's apprentice, declares, that he went with his master to visit Hugh Sunderland about four o'clock in the afternoon of the 24th of February, 1783, and saw Mr. Blain draw off Hugh Sutherland's urine with his own Catheter, neither Dr. Heysham, Mr. Hodgson, or any other medical person being present. That he thinks there was about three pints of urine; is certain there was above a quart. He further declares that he visited Hugh Sutherland a second time with his master that same evening, viz. about seven or eight o'clock, or before the usual time of locking up the shop; and that his master desired him to go to Mr. Creighton, and borrow Mr. Creighton's Catheters; that he did so, and returned with the Catheters immediately. That he then saw his master introduce Mr. Creighton's Catheter without the least difficulty, with which he drew off nearly the same quantity of urine as he had done before, viz. at four o'clock. He further declares that a little while after Mr. Creighton's Catheter had been withdrawn, and was lying on the table, Dr. Heysham came in, and Mr. Blain told him that he had just performed the above operation with Mr. Creighton's Catheter. He also declares that he afterwards saw Mr. Blain frequently draw off Hugh Sutherland's urine with Mr. Creighton's Catheters, one of which remained in his bladder a whole day; during which time he never heard Hugh Sutherland make the least complaint, tho' he saw him several times that very day. At another time he says Mr. Blain introduced a flexible Catheter, which remained in his bladder about three or four hours, when it was taken out on account of the pain which it occasioned. He never heard his master or Dr. Heysham tell Hugh Sutherland that the instrument was left in the bladder to try an experiment, or words to that effect.

He further declares that the following paragraph, towards the bottom of page 6th of the State of Facts, is a direct and absolute falsehood:

“ But the Doctor's memory, which appears very deceitful, will be greatly refreshed, “ by giving attention to Mr. Blain's apprentice, who declared, that one of them was but “ once introduced, and that immediately after the water had been first drawn off by “ Mr. Blain's own instrument.”

He never made use of any such words; as most of the Governors of the Dispensary must know, for he declared the very reverse of what is asserted before them in the Town-Hall on Friday evening the 22d of August.

Sworn before me, this 8th  
day of October, 1783,

ROB. HINDE.

JOSEPH GILL, Mayor.

## No. VI.

BENJAMIN BELL, Apothecary to the Carlisle Dispensary, declares that Hugh Sutherland came to the Dispensary on the 4th of July, 1783, to be admitted as a patient for a chronic rheumatism. After he had been some time in the room, Dr. Heysham asked Hugh Sutherland how long he thought Mr. Hodgson might be in attempting to introduce the Catheter, he answered he could not tell, but it was a long time. That the Doctor then said recollect yourself Hugh, and be as exact as you can, as you may be called upon again; do you think it was fifteen minutes; Hugh then said, that he thought it



it was twenty minutes or more, and that Mr. Hodgson brought away nothing but blood, and put him to a great deal of pain. That Dr. Heysham then desired Benjamin Bell to take particular notice of what he had heard Hugh Sutherland declare, as it might afterwards be of use.

Benjamin Bell further declares, that he went to Hugh Sutherland's house on the 27th of August, in order to dismiss him for irregularity; at which time Hugh Sutherland told him that he had been seized with a suppression of urine on the 25th, or two days before, that he sent for Mr. Hodgson to draw off his water, who he said *had hard wark at first, but got it done at last*. That Mr. Hodgson had then drawn it off four times; that the last time he had made two trials, but succeeded the second; and that Dr. Waite had been along with Mr. Hodgson, but does not recollect whether every time or not. Mr. Bell declares there were three Catheters in the room, one of which had a considerable quantity of clotted blood on the end of it; that when he was taking away the medicines, which had been sent from the Dispensary, Hugh desired him, several times in an anxious manner, to let them remain, saying they are of much use to me, and none to you.

Sworn before me, this 8th  
day of October, 1783,

BENJAMIN BELL.

JOSEPH GILL, Mayor.

## No. VII.

I THOMAS DIXON, of the city of Carlisle in the county of Cumberland, do hereby certify, that on the 23d day of August last past, about eleven of the clock in the forenoon of that day, to the best of my recollection and belief as to the time, I was talking with one Mary, the wife of Hugh Sutherland, a barber in Carlisle, upon the street between the shops off Messrs. Milliken and Blain, when the said Mr. Blain, (who is a Surgeon in Carlisle) being at his shop door, and observing me speaking to the said Mary Sutherland, came hastily up to us, and being much agitated, and in a passion with the said Mary, he told her she was a very base wicked woman; had told and asserted many things that were false, unjust, and untrue; and told her she was guilty of perjury. Upon which the said Mary replied, and said in my hearing, How can I be perjured, I was not sworn, or words to that effect.

Witness my hand this 8th day of October, 1783.

THO. DIXON.

## No. VIII.

I CERTIFY that the whole I intended by the certificate, published in Mr. Hodgson's State of Facts, was no more than that I had borrowed of Mr. Hodgson, previous to my beginning business in Burgh, and before I had furnished myself with instruments, some tooth-drawers and a fyringe.

October 12th, 1783.

WM. HODGSON.

---

\* \* \* Immediately before the last sheet was printed off I was informed, *from undoubted authority*, that Mr. Hodgson administered *the very same remedies to Wm. Cowin*, after he was dismissed from the Dispensary for irregularity, which *I had prescribed*, viz. the bark and elix. vitriol. Let Mr. H. after examining his own books, contradict this if he dare.

